DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 804 JC 740 113

AUTHOR Hall, George L.
TITLE State Boards for Community Colleges; An Analysis of Concepts and Practices.
INSTITUTION Florida Univ., Gainesville. Inst. of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Mar 74
NOTE 44p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Problems; *Administrator Attitudes; *Community Colleges; *Diaries; Governance; Meetings; Questionnaires; *State Boards of Education; Surveys

ABSTRACT

The present study attempted to analyze the agendas and minutes of meetings of State boards responsible for community colleges to ascertain the problems they face and gain some knowledge of the items that occupy their time. Board members' opinions were obtained as well to determine their perceptions concerning the major problems facing community colleges and the level at which resolution to these problems should occur. The main objective of the inquiry was to determine what the State board members feel are the major problems in governance and to relate the time spent at meetings to these concerns. Board agendas and minutes and members' opinions were obtained via mail. Analysis of agendas and minutes reveals that State boards devote the most time to financial matters, facilities and curricula, in that order, followed by personnel, policy matters and students. Board members considered the three most pressing matters to be finances, curricula, and articulation-coordination. Other problem areas mentioned were facility improvement, sources for planning, and insufficient staff. Responses are tabulated in an appendix, and a copy of the questionnaire is provided. A short bibliography concludes the report. (KM)

ED 089804

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE BOARDS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

An Analysis of Concepts and Practices

JC 740 113

George L. Hall
Executive Director
State Board of Directors
For
Community Colleges of Arizona

March 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword v

Section I
Overview 1

Section II
Scope and Plan 7

Section III
How State Board Members Spend Their Time at Meetings 10

Section IV
State Board Members Speak 14

Section V
Appendix 21

Section VI
Bibliography 40

FOREWORD

Over the past few years the Center for State and Regional Leadership in Higher Education working closely with the State Directors of Community Colleges has sponsored a number of studies related to state level coordination and/or control of community colleges. Some of those studies have been carried out by advance graduate students, others by State Directors themselves.

This analysis was accomplished through the contributions of Dr. George L. Hall, Executive Director for the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona. Dr. Hall brings the perspective of experience and scholarship to this study. The Center provides him with support through funds made available in part from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. This report is a part of a series.

While there remains much to be done in understanding and thereby influencing the development of state level coordination, each study of this type will provide basis for improvement. State Boards can improve their own activities and thereby improve their contributions to the operation of community colleges. This study will be of service in that regard.

I am indebted to my colleague at Florida State University, Dr. Louis W. Bender, for his continued help in preparing this and other reports for distribution.

James L. Wattenbarger, Director
Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

March, 1974

SECTION I

Overview

STATE BOARDS RESPONSIBLE FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Concepts and Practices

SECTION I: Overview

The state boards responsible for senior colleges and universities are frequently analyzed, as are the members of such boards. Today, the community college governing boards and their members are generally included in such studies of boards of higher education. James L. Wattenbarger and Melvyn Sakaguchi reported on the state boards responsible for community colleges in a study released in August, 1971.[1] They examined the broad areas of responsibility of such boards and classified them according to their responsibilities for the control and coordination of the state community colleges.

The present study attempted to analyze the agendas and minutes of meetings of state boards responsible for community colleges to ascertain the problems faced by them and to gain some knowledge about the items that occupy the time of the men and women responsible at the state level for the direction of the nation's community colleges.

A further facet to the investigation involved the board members' opinions concerning the major problems facing the community colleges and

[1]See Bibliography.

their opinions regarding the level, state or local, at which resolution of the problems should occur.

The main objective of this inquiry was to determine what the state board members feel to be the major problems in the governance of community college education and to relate the hours spent at board meetings to these major concerns. A secondary consideration of the study was to identify differences, if any, in the matters above as they relate to the various types of state boards responsible for community colleges at the state level.

It was assumed that by classifying each state board according to its organizational type as developed by Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi and placing them into groups, one might see in what ways the four state board "types" differ or agree in respect to the subjects considered for board action.

The four types are: (1) state board for community colleges only; (2) state board for all higher education; (3) university board responsible also for community colleges; and (4) state board for all public education.

To assist in the analysis of the items receiving the most consideration and attention at state board meetings, the items from agendas and minutes were placed into one of eight categories: (1)planning; (2) fiscal or budget; (3) curricula and instruction; (4) facilities and land; (5) policies, standards, regulations; (6) students; (7) personnel; and (8) miscellaneous.

It is recognized that these categories are arbitrary and overlapping. They also require value judgments as in the case of a board's action in approving a budget of specified dollars to engage staff for a new educational program. This item could be classified as (1) budget; (2) personnel;

or (3) instruction-curriculum. This writer chose the first option.

A further limitation is recognized in that tabulating the number of motions passed during a board session does not reveal how much time was actually spent. Also, there may have been several topics discussed which required more time but which did not end in the passing of a motion.

It is important to recognize that the state boards for community colleges differ in their authority and responsibility. Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi reported that the states could be divided into three groups according to their responsibility for the community colleges. Nine of the states actually "govern" the community colleges while seventeen have a "governing coordination" role and the largest number of states, 23, fall into a "coordinating role" (see Table No. 1). One might suspect that the state boards with authority to "govern" would have different interests than the state boards charged only with "coordination".

In any study of the responsibility of boards for higher education, the question of control must be faced. The question of who controls community colleges is most difficult to answer as observed by Peter K. Mills following his survey of community college trustees.[2] Control is maintained in a variety of ways in the different states. The only commonality of the boards, whether local, statewide, or regional, is that there is in each case a group of laymen as the board of control. The passage of the Higher Education Acts of 1972 calling for statewide coordination of all post-secondary education reveals a "national interest" in the state level control of community colleges.

[2]Mills, Peter K., Community College Trustees, A Survey. Report of AGB, December 1972.

Table 1

STATE LEVEL BOARDS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1970				
Totals	Board Responsible for Community Colleges only	Board Responsible for All Higher Education	Board Responsible for University System	Board Responsible for all Levels of Education
Governing 9	Minnesota Delaware Connecticut 3	Georgia Utah West Virginia 3	Hawaii 1	Louisiana Tennessee 2
Governing/ Coordinating 11	Massachusetts Washington Virginia Arizona Colorado 5	0	Alaska Kentucky Nevada New York 4	Alabama Oregon 2
Coordinating 23	California Illinois Mississippi Maryland Wyoming 5	Arkansas New Mexico New Jersey Ohio Oklahoma South Carolina Texas Wisconsin 8	0	Florida Idaho Iowa Kansas Michigan Missouri Montana North Carolina Pennsylvania Rhode Island 10
TOTALS 43	13	11	5	14

Source: Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi, 1971.

Local governing board members, not state board members, were the subject of the Mills survey cited above. Mills found that the local board members strongly favored state wide coordination of community college education through a state system of higher education rather than through the office responsible for the public schools. His survey, however, did not go into the local board-state board relationships, and as so often is the case, one can only say, this is an area that deserves thorough investigation and analysis.

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and colleges touched on this matter of local board-state board authority and substantiated[3] the belief that local board members do not favor strong state boards for higher education but by a margin of three to one stated that states should have less control over public institutions. They do not feel that state authorities place the most able men and women on public boards. The local board members do believe that guidelines should be established to place the most able people on the statewide boards.

Mills states that more than 60% of the local community college board members believe that institutional independence is in serious danger and 42% believe that increasing centralization of state authority is a major cause. On the other hand a majority feels that the states should organize a state commission to plan and coordinate federal monies. Perhaps the local college board members are saying they don't like it, they don't want it, but they know it's coming.

---

[3]Before the 1973 National Conference on Trusteeship, the Association of Governing Boards surveyed 1,615 chairmen of local governing boards. The results of that survey are reported in "Supplement to AGB notes, April, 1973" published by the Association of Governing Boards, One Dupont Circle, Suite 720, Washington, D. C. 20036.

SECTION II

Scope and Plan

SECTION II: Scope and Plan

During the spring of 1973, a letter was sent to 41 state directors of community colleges[4] requesting (1) a listing of state board members, and (2) a duplicate copy of board agendas and minutes for the year 1972. Twenty-six, or 63%, of the states responded to some part of the request but only 20 of the states submitted sufficient data to be included in the study. Those states not sending agendas and minutes did not comply for a variety of reasons. They were not organized at the state level for community colleges; they cited excessive cost in time and dollars in complying with the request, or the community colleges were too integrated with other schools to be separated. Only one state cited prohibition against compliance. (South Carolina stated that, "Board policy prohibits me sending you a copy of the agendas and minutes of the meetingsfor 1972.")

The listings of state board members, agendas and minutes were identified as to the type of state organization. (Copies of the letter of request to state directors of community colleges and more definitive information concerning the returns are found in the Tables.)

A second part of this investigation involves opinions of individual members of state boards for community colleges. It is believed that the opinions of the men and women in control at state level of the nation's community colleges are essential to the understanding of the status of their governance. Accordingly, 100 state board members selected at random

---

[4]Letters were sent to 41 states. States which were not included were Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Vermont.

were mailed questionnaires[5] and were asked to list, in order of importance, the three most pressing concerns pertaining to community colleges. This was an open-ended question with no suggestions for choice or selection. The board members were asked also to indicate the level for resolution of the problems listed, whether state, local or both. Questions were also asked to ascertain what single accomplishment of the community colleges pleased them most and what changes they would suggest for governance at the state level. The questionnaire sought to learn what staff was needed by the various state boards. The question was asked of state board members, "What are the most pressing state level staff needs?" The question was not well stated for apparently some respondents, rather than listing needed personnel, listed the needs of the state staff (see questionnaire in appendix and the summary of responses in tables).

See Appendix

S E C T I O N III

How State Board Members Spend Their Time At Meetings

SECTION III: How State Board Members Spend Their Time At Meetings.

The analysis of state board agendas and minutes for 1972 reveals that state boards devote the most time to financial matters, facilities and curricula, in that order. Personnel, policy matters and students follow next in line for the state board members' attention. There are more than twice as many resolutions passed concerning financial matters as there are resolutions concerning personnel and over three times as many resolutions concerned with finance as with general policy issues.

In states where there is one board for all education or where a single board is in control of all higher education, a simple counting for formal resolutions specifically mentioning community colleges does not represent the true consideration given to community colleges. The analysis of minutes in the State of Ohio for example, reveals that much consideration is rendered the community colleges and technical institutes but there are not a large number for formal actions taken for the community colleges.

The Ohio Board of Regents appears to take several formal actions that apply to all institutions of higher education. For this reason, one is cautioned not to compare one state with another state in terms of formal resolutions pertaining to community colleges as the comparison of the number of resolutions passed is meaning less and further, only resolutions pertaining specifically to community colleges are tabulated in this survey. The number of resolutions a state passes has no significance in comparing one state with another. The number of resolutions has validity only in assessing the kinds of resolutions any one board considers.

Some state boards do consider many more formal resolutions than do others, and the analysis revealed that this fact does not depend upon the

organizational type of state board. For example, Maryland, a type I board (for community colleges only), acted upon twenty-three (23) formal resolutions while Illinois another type I state board acted upon 291 formal resolutions!

One state which places all public education under one board of control considered 519 formal resolutions during the year's nine board meetings. Thirty-five (35) of the resolutions pertained to community colleges. Thus, the community colleges were a consideration in about 6% of the resolutions acted on by the state board.

The problem faced by board members in such situatiuns is well stated by a member of the board cited above. The board was asked to approve the annual budgets for twelve (12) colleges and universities, many of them major universities. One board member said: "....it is impossible for a member of the board to vote on these (budgets) with any understanding, logic and any likelihood of reality - in fact, the -----state system of education excludes the State Board of Education from taking a serious part in budget deliberations dealing with institutions under its so called control."

ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE UNIMPORTANT IN HOW THEY SPEND THEIR TIME

The analysis of state board meeting minutes reveals no discernable differences among the different organizational types in the matter of how the state boards spend their time. In other words, the state boards responsible only for community colleges discuss and take action on the same kind of items as do the state boards in charge of all education. Each

state board is concerned and occupied with issues involving finance, facilities and curricula and in about that order.

There is a high correlation between state board members perception of major problem areas and the issues they discuss at board meetings. For example, in order of priority they list financial matters, curricula and articulation-coordination as the most pressing problems. Actually they devote most attention at board meetings to financial matters, facilities and curricula.

The state board members are concerned over problems of coordination within their respective states and yet little time is devoted to coordination during board meetings. An obvious observation is that the problems of coordination are not in their province and therefore not capable of their solution.

In actual practice the state boards devote most time to sites and physical plants and the problems peculiar to these topics. They don't however, describe facilities as a pressing problem.

S E C T I O N IV

State Board Members Speak

SECTION IV

STATE BOARD MEMBERS SPEAK[1]

Most Pressing Problems

When asked to name the three most pressing matters which concern them as state board members, they said:

1. Financial matters
2. Curricular Affairs
3. Articulation - Coordination

About one-third named financial problems, while one-fourth cited curricular matters and about one out of eight named problems in articulation and coordination. Several other problem areas mentioned were: the need for improved facilities, sources for planning, and insufficient staff personnel.

The Problem in Financing Community Colleges

Those citing finance as the number one problem said:

"We need more money for buildings, expansion of curricula and modern equipment."

"We need more adequate financing and a less cumbersome method of establishing budgets."

"Management information is needed for budget preparation."

"...greater autonomy in fiscal areas..."

---

[1]100 board members were selected at random from the listing of state board members to receive questionnaires. 53 state board members responded which is a return of 53%. The respondents represented the four organizational types of state board.

"More fiscal independence for the state board."

"New financing is needed to replace tuition and federal losses."

Problems in Curricula

State board members talking about the curricular needs said:

"Methods in weeding out obsolete or unsuccessful low priority programs are needed."

"Eliminating duplication (unnecessary) of programs and achieving inter-college cooperation and collaboration."

"Strengthening the technical-vocational roles and programs of the community colleges."

"The problem of securing a general authority at state level for educational program coordination and approval."

"A curriculum broad enough and interesting enough to attract students and yet be economic enough to warrant continued operation."

The Problem of Statewide Articulation and Coordination

Some of the more urgent statements were concerned with the matter of articulation and coordination:

"We need clearer definition of the coordinating function of the state board. The board must have additional legislative authority to implement the intent."

"....more junior college representation on the Board of Higher Education."

"There are too many agencies involved in the educational structure in our state. There exists competition among the various boards. There are associations of local trustees, associations of college presidents, a faculty association, and a student association."

"We need to work out some sort of thing in relation to local and state boards."

"There must be better articulation with four-year institutions."

"We must preserve local control!"

"There is interference by other political agencies such as the Department of Finance, Department of Personnel, Department of Public Works, etc., which delay or deny the statutory mandate."

"State control of community colleges is divided between the coordinating board, the college and university system and the education agency. One authority is needed, probably a central board."

"Vocational programs are handled by one agency; the academic programs by another. This presents a funding problem."

"Let the state coordinating board handle that which it was created for. Take the 'pork barrel' out of legislation."

"A single system must be evolved and eventually used to the exclusion of others."

"How to integrate the system?"

"Articulation of higher institutions."

"A master plan for postsecondary education, delineating the role of the various agencies."

State Boards--Local Boards Together Can Solve Problems

The state board members were of the opinion that their statewide problems capable of solution by those involved with community college affairs could best be handled in cooperation with the local college trustees. Nearly 60% said that the problem could be resolved by joint action of local boards-

state boards. Approximately 30% however, felt that the state board was best equipped to handle the problems.

Are The States Well Organized For The Governance Of Community Colleges

The state board members were asked if they felt that their state was "well organized to govern the community colleges." They revealed strong support and satisfaction. Over 75% said, "Yes", while about 20% thought not.

Roles Of State Boards Need Clarification

When asked what organizational changes were needed in their state, nearly one-half cited the need for clearer definition of roles of state board and other boards and agencies. That coordination is a major problem is evident when it is realized that the question asked was open-ended and did not offer suggestions, yet one-half of all state board members identified this as the Number One problem! The only other area for needed change where a number could agree was that of finance.

Pleased That The Community Colleges Are Extending The Opportunity for Higher Education

The state board members were proudest of developing a major system of education over a few years time and in so doing, extending the opportunity for higher education.

The board members said:

"The completion of the state master plan of developing 28 community

colleges within commuting distance of 99% of the state's population."

"Growth in number of such colleges over the state in just a few years and success of each."

"Post-high school educational opportunities throughout the entire state."

"Leadership role in attempting to offer a low cost, post-high school education of high academic and vocational value to the people."

"Opportunity for more to attend."

"Making public aware of value of community colleges."

"The 'open door' policy, giving everyone a chance; making higher education available to all people..."

Appreciation of Vocational-Technical Education

They were also pleased that vocational-technical and career education were emphasized, stating:

"Shifting of emphasis to 'career education'."

"The response of employers to vocational graduates."

"The excellent service to industry through vocational-technical training..."

"A very heavy vocational enrollment."

Sense of Purpose

Others cited the preservation of local control and the board's integrity and sense of purpose. They said:

"The independent attitude of objectivity and mutual respect for the State Department of Education and for each of the colleges."

"Being a part of a dynamic, innovative system where the primary control and responsibility is at the local board-level - it works!"

"The evidence of the dedication to the ideal of service."

"The maintenance of a board having high integrity and free of political influences."

"The sense of purpose and devotion of a loyal board is an impressive and vital part of our country's educational system."

Staffing Needs

As stated in Section I, the wording of the question regarding additional staff needed was not clear, but state board members were clear in stating that they needed, "management information", "research", and "evaluative techniques." The kinds of personnel most needed appear to be personnel capable of research and evaluation and general staff.

SECTION V

Appendix

APPENDIX

The 50 states are organized variously for the governance of community colleges as each is shaped by tradition, bias, and experience. Wattenbarger and Sakaguchi divide the states into four types of organizational form.[1] These are:

Type 1	State board for community colleges only
Type 2	State board for all higher education
Type 3	University board responsible also for community colleges
Type 4	State board for public education

The following chart classifies the various states by type as defined above:

Type 1

Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming

Type 2

Arkansas, Georgia, New Mexico, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin

Type 3

Alaska, Hawaii, Kentucky, Nevada, New York

Type 4

Alabama, Florida, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Nebraska

Six states are excluded. In five states, Indiana, Maine, New Hampshire, South Dakota, and Vermont, public community colleges are not established or they are strictly locally controlled. North Dakota has five community colleges but exercises no common type of control.

---

[1] State Level Patterns For Community Junior Colleges: Patterns of Control and Coordination; James L. Wattenbarger and Melvyn Sakaguchi, Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, August, 1971.

Table 2

States Which Participated in the Study

State	Type[1]	Agendas Provided	Minutes Provided	Questionnaire Responses
Alabama	4	x	x	
California	1	x	x	x
Colorado	1	x		x
Connecticut	1	x	x	x
Florida	4	x		x
Illinois	1	x	x	x
Iowa	4	x	x	x
Kansas	4	x	x	
Louisiana	4	x	x	
Maryland	1	x	x	x
Massachusetts	1	x	x	x
Minnesota	1	x	x	
Nebraska	4	x	x	
Nevada	3	x	x	x
New York	3			
Ohio	2	x	x	x
Oregon	4	x	x	
Pennsylvania	4	x	x	x
Texas	2	x	x	x
Utah	2	x	x	x

[1] For type, see p. 22.

TABLE 3

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF MOTIONS PASSED

BY

STATE BOARDS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

State	Type of Resolution	No. of Motions	Percent of Total
ALABAMA	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	2	9.1
	Curricula	9	40.9
	Facilities	7	31.8
	Policies	3	13.6
	Students	1	4.6
	Miscellaneous	0	0
	Personnel	0	0
	TOTAL	22	100.0
CALIFORNIA	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	13	27.1
	Curricula	23	47.9
	Facilities	0	0
	Policies	10	20.8
	Students	1	2.1
	Miscellaneous	1	2.1
	Personnel	0	0
	TOTAL	48	100.0
COLORADO	Planning	3	1.6
	Fiscal	43	22.6
	Curricula	29	15.3
	Facilities	31	16.3
	Policies	10	5.3
	Students	4	2.1
	Miscellaneous	39	2[illegible]5
	Personnel	31	16.3
	TOTAL	190	100.0
CONNECTICUT	Planning	1	.6
	Fiscal	27	15.5
	Curricula	11	6.3
	Facilities	16	9.2
	Policies	9	5.2
	Students	1	.6
	Miscellaneous	20	11.5
	Personnel	89	51.1
	TOTAL	174	100.0

State	Type of Resolution	No. of Motions	Percent of Total
FLORIDA	Planning	1	5.5
	Fiscal	5	27.8
	Curricula	2	11.1
	Facilities	1	5.6
	Policies	4	22.2
	Students	0	0
	Miscellaneous	1	5.6
	Personnel	4	22.2
	TOTAL	18	100.0
ILLINOIS	Planning	4	1.4
	Fiscal	68	23.4
	Curricula	39	13.4
	Facilities	90	30.9
	Policies	15	5.1
	Students	25	8.6
	Miscellaneous	18	6.2
	Personnel	32	11.0
	TOTAL	291	100.0
LOUISIANA	Planning	2	5.7
	Fiscal	9	25.7
	Curricula	2	5.7
	Facilities	6	17.2
	Policies	2	5.7
	Students	0	0
	Miscellaneous	5	14.3
	Personnel	9	25.7
	TOTAL	35	100.0
MARYLAND	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	1	4.3
	Curricula	2	8.7
	Facilities	17	74.0
	Policies	2	8.7
	Students	0	0
	Miscellaneous	1	4.3
	Personnel	0	0
	TOTAL	23	100.0
MASSACHUSETTS	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	21	13.9
	Curricula	23	15.2
	Facilities	31	20.5
	Policies	1	.7
	Students	12	7.9
	Miscellaneous	17	11.3
	Personnel	46	30.5
	TOTAL	151	100.0

State	Type of Resolution	No. of Motions	Percent of Total
MINNESOTA	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	26	25.7
	Curricula	12	11.9
	Facilities	0	0
	Policies	3	3.0
	Students	7	6.9
	Miscellaneous	33	32.7
	Personnel	20	19.8
	TOTAL	101	100.0
Nebraska	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	23	37.1
	Curricula	1	1.6
	Facilities	0	0
	Policies	3	4.8
	Students	11	17.8
	Miscellaneous	23	37.1
	Personnel	1	1.6
	TOTAL	62	100.0
Nevada	Planning	6	8.7
	Fiscal	12	17.4
	Curricula	4	5.8
	Facilities	20	29.0
	Policies	6	8.7
	Students	6	8.7
	Miscellaneous	1	1.4
	Personnel	14	20.3
	TOTAL	69	100.0
New York	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	66	66.6
	Curricula	9	9.1
	Facilities	9	9.1
	Policies	5	5.1
	Students	0	0
	Miscellaneous	0	0
	Personnel	10	10.1
	TOTAL	99	100.0
Ohio	Planning	6	8.7
	Fiscal	12	17.4
	Curricula	4	5.8
	Facilities	20	29.0
	Policies	6	8.7
	Students	6	8.7
	Miscellaneous	1	1.4
	Personnel	14	20.3
		69	100.0

State	Type of Resolution	No. of Motions	Percent of Total
OREGON	Planning	2	12.5
	Fiscal	3	18.9
	Curricula	1	6.2
	Facilities	8	50.0
	Policies	1	6.2
	Students	1	6.2
	Miscellaneous	0	0
	Personnel	0	0
	TOTAL	16	100.0
TEXAS	Planning	0	0
	Fiscal	2	9.5
	Curricula	2	9.5
	Facilities	12	57.2
	Policies	3	14.3
	Students	0	0
	Miscellaneous	2	9.5
	Personnel	0	0
	TOTAL	21	100.0
UTAH	Planning	6	8.5
	Fiscal	8	11.3
	Curricula	25	35.2
	Facilites	23	32.4
	Policies	7	9.8
	Students	1	1.4
	Miscellaneous	0	0
	Personnel	1	1.4
	TOTAL	71	100.0

TABLE 4

HOW STATE BOARDS SPEND THEIR TIME

State	Curricula	Facilities	Fiscal	Personnel	Policies
Alabama	1 (3)	2 (2)			3 (1)
California	1 (3)		2 (2)		3 (1)
Colorado		2 (2)	1 (3)	2 (2)	
Connecticut		3 (1)	2 (2)	1 (3)	
Florida	3 (1)		1 (3)		2 (2)
Illinois	3 (1)	1 (3)	2 (2)		
Louisiana		2 (2)	1 (2)	3 (1)	
Maryland	2 (2)	1 (3)			2 (2)
Massachusetts	3 (1)	2 (2)		1 (3)	
Minnesota	3 (1)		1 (3)	2 (2)	
Nebraska		3 (1)	1 (3)		
Nevada		1 (3)	2 (2)		3 (1)
New York	3 (1)	3 (1)	1 (3)	2 (2)	
Ohio	1 (3)	2 (2)	3 (1)		
Oregon		1 (3)	1 (3)		2 (2)
Texas	3 (1)	1 (3)	3 (1)		2 (2)
Utah	1 (3)	2 (2)	3 (1)	____	____
TOTALS	(20)	(30)	(31)	(13)	(11)

NB. 1, 2, or 3 is assigned the state indicating the most time spent on the various area. Number 1 indicates the most time spent. The ranking numbers were then weighted to determine the priorities (1=3, 2=2, 3=1).

Table 5

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STATES WHOSE BOARD MEMBERS RESPONDED TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY ORGANIZATIONAL TYPE

Organizational Type	States Whose Board Members Received Questionnaires		States Whose Board Members Returned Questionnaires	
	N	%	N	%
I	7	35.0	6	46.1
II	3	15.0	3	23.1
III	1	5.0	1	7.7
IV	9	45.0	3	23.1
TOTAL	20	100.0	13	100.0

TABLE 6

MOST PRESSING PROBLEMS

Most Pressing Problems are in the area of:	Organizational Type*				TOTAL	
	Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	N	%
Planning	4			2	6	4.05
Personnel	3	1		1	5	3.40
Fiscal	25	7	2	12	46	31.08
Curriculum	18	9	2	8	37	25.00
Facilities	6				6	4.05
Policies	2				2	1.35
Students					0	0
Coordination	10	4	2	3	19	12.83
Miscellaneous	9	10		8	27	18.24
TOTAL	77	31	6	34	148	100.00

* Type I: State Community College Board

Type II: State Board for All Higher Education

Type III: University Board Responsible for Community Colleges

Type IV: State Board for All Education

TABLE 7

WHICH BOARD MAY BEST SOLVE
THE
PROBLEMS?*

Problem	Problems can best be resolved by:				
	STATE BD.	LOCAL BD.	TOGETHER	NO RESP.	TOTAL
Planning	2	1	4	1	6
Personnel	1	1	2	1	5
Fiscal	15		30	1	46
Curricula	8	6	22	1	37
Facilities	3		1	2	6
Policy	1		1		2
Students					0
Coordination	7		10	2	19
Misc.	6	4	17		27
TOTALS: PERCENTAGE:	43 (29.1%)	11 (7.4%)	87 (58.8%)	7 (4.7%)	148 (100%)

* As identified by State Board Members

Sample Letter

February 15, 1973

Dear

In cooperation with the Southeastern Community College Leadership Program, we propose to study the interests of various state-level boards for community junior colleges. In a sense, this is an extension of the study reported in 1971 by James L. Wattenbarger and Melvyn Sakaguchi.

May we ask that you provide us with these two items:

1. Listing of present state board members (name and address) and year of their initial appointment of election.

2. A duplicate, or Xerox copy of agendas and minutes for the year 1972, January through December.

We propose to analyze the minutes to determine the kinds of matters which are acted upon by state board members. We will be happy to share our findings with you.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Cordially,

George L. Hall
Executive Director

mg
cc: James L. Wattenbarger
Lou Bender

Cover Letter

Dear Mr.

In cooperation with the Center for State and Regional Leadership in community colleges, we are inquiring into areas of concern pertaining to community colleges as perceived by members of state boards responsible for higher education. This is a national study. Your response is most important.

Will you please answer the questions on the attached page and return in the addressed stamped envelope.

Thank you for your thoughtful attention and assistance. The confidentiality of your response will be preserved. If you would like a copy of the final report, please so indicate to me.

Sincerely,

George L. Hall
Executive Director

GLH:ej

Attachments

Questionnaire

State_____

I. List in order of importance the three most pressing matters pertaining to community colleges that are of concern to you as a board member.

1. _____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

3. _____

_____

_____

II. In each of the above areas, do you believe the solution can best be resolved by (1) the State Board, (2) local board or college, or (3) State Board and local board or college together?

	Solved by (check one)		
	State Board:	Local Board:	Both:
Concern Number 1 (above)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Concern Number 2 (above)	(1)	(2)	(3)
Concern Number 3 (above)	(1)	(2)	(3)

III. In relation to community colleges, what single accomplishment, action or activity of the State Board you serve pleases you most?_____

_____

_____

IV. Do you believe that your state is well organized to govern the community colleges? YES ( ) NO ( )

What changes would you suggest?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

V. What are your most pressing state level staff needs?_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

SBDCCA
3/30/73
ej

Table 8

SUGGESTED CHANGES IN STATE ORGANIZATION

	TYPE I	TYPE II	TYPE III	TYPE IV	TOTAL N	TOTAL %
Statutes pertaining to organization of new districts				1	1	2.77
Junior college should be extension of high school vocational concept instead of higher education				1	1	2.77
Budget and finance	4	1		2	7	19.46
More independence in Dept. of Ed.				1	1	2.77
Eliminate voc-tech division and make it part of community college division				1	1	2.77
Develop qualifications for trustees				1	1	2.77
More responsibility to community college council & division rather than the State Board of Education				1	1	2.77
More local control	1				1	2.77
Clearer definition of coordination role of state board & other agencies	12	5			17	47.30
More women in decision-making roles	1				1	2.77
More attention to policy; less to activities	1				1	2.77
Board needs more input on enrollments and programs to aid in decision-making	1				1	2.77
Colleges need to be located nearer to population centers		1			1	2.77
Single system needed		1			1	2.77
TOTAL	20	8	0	8	36	100.00

Table 9

BOARD MEMBERS' SATISFACTION WITH STATE ORGANIZATION TO GOVERN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Question #4

Do you believe that your state is well organized to govern the community colleges?

	TYPE I		TYPE II		TYPE III		TYPE IV		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YES	19	73.1	7	63.6	2	100	11	91.7	39	76.5
NO	6	23.1	4	36.4	0	0	0	0	10	19.6
No response	1	3.8	0	0	0	0	1	8.3	2	3.9
TOTALS	26	100%	11	100%	2	100%	12	100%	51	100%

Table 10

MOST OUTSTANDING ACCOMPLISHMENT OF STATE BOARD (AS IDENTIFIED BY STATE BOARD MEMBERS)

	TYPE I	TYPE II	TYPE III	TYPE IV	TOTAL N	TOTAL %
Board's devotion, integrity, sense of purpose	3				3	6.7
Preservation of local control	2			1	3	6.7
Public awareness and support		1		1	2	4.4
Development of master plan	1			1	2	4.4
Development of capital construction program	1				1	2.2
Improvements in capital facilities & curriculum		1			1	2.2
Emphasis on other than elaborate plants				1	1	2.2
Development of major system in limited years	5	2		1	8	17.8
Every area of state in a community college district				1	1	2.2
Uniform reporting system		1		1	2	4.4
Development of policy manual	1				1	2.2
More adequate funding		1			1	2.2
Policy making higher education available to more people	1		1	2	4	9.0
Articulation and cooperation between institutions		2		1	3	6.7
Increase in enrollment and community services	1				1	2.2
Continuing education;life-long learning	1				1	2.2
Increase in EOP programs	2				2	4.4
New occupational-emphasis colleges in metropolitan area	3				3	6.7
Emphasis on career or vocational-technical education	1	1	1	2	5	11.2
TOTAL	22	9	2	12	45	100.0

TABLE 11

STATE-LEVEL STAFFING NEEDS
AS PERCEIVED BY
MEMBERS OF STATE BOARDS

	Type I	Type II	Type III	Type IV	TOTAL
Management information, research & evaluation personnel	4			4	8
Analysis of data	1				1
Engineers (building program)	1				1
Program development	2			1	3
Facilities, operations	1				1
Follow-up personnel	1				1
Outreach programs	1				1
Promotion of C. C. movement	1				1
Chancellor (new)	1				1
Replacing retiring fiscal officer	1				1
Coordinator of Voc-Tech Education		1			1
Personnel for student loan program		1			1
Planning personnel				2	2
Additional staff (general)	6	2		1	9
Better salaries	1	1			2
Attracting high-caliber people	1			1	2
Support from state officials	1				1
New financing		1			1
Reorganization of staff				1	1
Coordination of K-12 and beyond				1	1
More money for travel				1	1
Other needs out weigh staff needs	1				1
TOTALS	24	6	0	12	42

SECTION VI

Selected Bibliography

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Mills, Peter K., Community College Trustees: A Survey, Special Report of the Association of Governing Boards. The Two-Year College Trustee: National Issues and Perspectives, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle NW, Washington, D.C. 20036, December 1972.

Wattenbarger, James L., Frank Logotic and Willis Holcombe. The State Directors of Community Colleges and Their Staffs, a 1973 Reexamination. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, 1973.

Wattenbarger, James L. and Melvyn Sakaguchi, State Level Boards for Community and Junior Colleges: Patterns of Control and Coordination. Gainesville: Institute of Higher Education, University of Florida, August 1971.

Zwingle, J. L. and Mabel Rogers, State Boards Responsible for Higher Education 1970. Office of Education Publication 50067. Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

MAGAZINES, BULLETINS, ETC.

"Trusteeship: An Overview." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44, No. 2 (October 1973), 7-20.

"1973 AGB Survey of Board Chairman Opinion, A Survey of 1,615 Chairmen of Governing Boards." Supplement to AGB Notes, April 1973; Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, one Dupont Circle, Suite 720, Washington, D.C. 20036.

"The Trustee and Public Expectations", AGB Reports Vol. 16, No. 1, September 1973, Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, one Dupont Circle, Suite 720, Washington, D.C. 20036.

DISSERTATIONS

Gilliland, John Richard, "Members of Boards of Trustees of Florida junior Colleges: Their Personal Characteristics and Opinions about Institutional Role and Governance." August 1969.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF
LOS ANGELES

APR 24 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION